

M
4
8
8

entER
for
Economic Research

Discussion paper

6.5.11
218
28



6.5.11
218
28



Center
for
Economic Research

No. 9868

ENDOGENOUS PRICE LEADERSHIP

By Eric van Damme and Sjaak Hurkens

July 1998

ISSN 0924-7815

Endogenous Price Leadership*

Eric van Damme[†]

Sjaak Hurkens[‡]

May 1998

Abstract

We consider a linear price setting duopoly game with differentiated products and determine endogenously which of the players will lead and which will follow. While the follower role is most attractive for each firm, we show that waiting is more risky for the low cost firm so that, consequently, risk dominance considerations, as in Harsanyi and Selten (1988), allow the conclusion that only the high cost firm will choose to wait. Hence, the low cost firm will emerge as the endogenous price leader.

*Hurkens thanks partial support of the CIRIT, Generalitat de Catalunya (1997SGR 00138) and of the DGES (PB96-0302).

[†] CentER, Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands.

[‡] Department of Economics, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Ramon Trias Fargas 25-27, 08005 Barcelona, Spain.

1 Introduction

Standard game theoretic models of oligopoly situations impose the order of the moves exogenously, an assumption that was already criticized in Von Stackelberg (1934), well before game theory invaded the field of industrial organization. Von Stackelberg pointed out that players have preferences over which role (leader or follower) to play in the game and he argued that a stable equilibrium would result only if the actual role assignment would be consistent with these preferences. As Von Stackelberg argued, in many situations both duopolists prefer the same role so that a stable situation does not appear to exist. In particular, Von Stackelberg showed that a player benefits from taking the role of leader and he argued that frequently a fight — a Stackelberg war — will arise as to who will assume this leadership role.

While it is indeed true that, under general conditions, a duopolist prefers to move first rather than to move simultaneous, it should not necessarily be concluded that the leadership role is the most preferred one: a player might benefit even more if the other player moves first. As is well-known, this latter state of affairs arises under price competition when products are substitutes (See Boyer and Moreaux (1987), Dowrick (1986) and Gal-Or (1985)). The result follows from the fact that reaction curves are increasing in this case and the basic intuition can be easily seen when firms are identical. First of all one notices that the price of the leader p^L is larger than the Nash equilibrium price p^N since the leader's total profit, taking into account the rival's optimal reaction, is increasing in his price at the Nash equilibrium. Since the follower's reaction curve is flatter than the 45 degree line, the follower's price p^F is smaller than p^L . Consequently, $\pi^F(p^L, p^F) > \pi^F(p^L, p^L) = \pi^L(p^L, p^L) > \pi^L(p^L, p^F) > \pi^L(p^N, p^N)$. (The first inequality follows since p^F is on the follower's reaction curve, the second since the leader profits from a higher price of the follower, and the last since the leader could have chosen p^N instead of p^L .) Hence, if firms are identical, each firm prefers following above leading, while any sequential order is preferred above moving simultaneously. By continuity, these preferences remain when differences between the firms are not too large.

Given that each player prefers following above leading and given that any sequential ordering of the moves is unanimously preferred above moving simultaneously, the question arises which player will hold out and which one will move first? Which ordering will arise when the order of the moves is determined strategically by the players? Which duopolist will decide to become the price leader? It is this question that we address in this paper. We consider a duopoly situation with differentiated substitutable products and linear demand. The demand structure is symmetric across firms, but firms are asymmetric as far as the costs are concerned: one firm is more efficient than the other and has lower marginal costs. Obviously, at least one asymmetry is needed to make a definite prediction; if the situation would be fully symmetric then the two possible sequential orderings would be indistinguishable. The question we address then is whether the efficient or the inefficient firm will become the price leader.

The formal model that we use to solve this problem has been introduced in Hamilton and Slutsky (1990). It allows firms to move, i.e. to choose a price, either early or late. Choices within a period are simultaneous but if one firm moves early and the other moves late, the latter is informed about the former's price before making its choice. Since following confers advantages each player is tempted to move late, but obviously the situation in which both move late is not an equilibrium, since this would result in the Nash payoffs and then each player would have an incentive to move early. Specifically, the game has two equilibria corresponding to the two possible sequential orderings of the moves and the players have opposite preferences about these equilibria. In our view, the question of who will take up the most preferred role amounts to solving the problem of which player is willing to take the largest risk in waiting and we formally answer this question by using the risk-dominance concept from Harsanyi and Selten (1988), which allows one to quantify the risks involved. The conclusion is that waiting is more risky for the low cost firm, hence, the efficient firm will emerge as the price leader and the less efficient firm will take up the more favorable follower role.

One can conceive of alternative ways of selecting among the two Stackelberg equilibria. One way would be to look at which player would benefit most by moving late. Denoting

player i 's payoff as a leader (resp. follower) by L_i (resp. F_i), one can argue that if

$$F_i - L_i > F_j - L_j,$$

then the equilibrium in which i becomes the follower is most focal since that player has most to gain from following and hence that players will coordinate on this one. Alternatively, one might argue that the equilibrium in which total profits are highest is most focal, hence, that i will follow if and only if

$$F_i + L_j > F_j + L_i.$$

Clearly, this latter inequality is equivalent to the first, so that both approaches would predict the same leadership pattern. Both these approaches are essentially based on an idea of collective rationality, since it is assumed that players are able to solve the coordination problem. Our approach is purely individualistic since each firm only takes into account it's own expected profit and this is why we prefer this approach. Nevertheless, it is good to point out that in this particular instance our approach produces the same outcome: the above inequalities are satisfied when i is the high cost firm. Hence, all three approaches lead to the conclusion that the efficient firm will lead.

Our paper thus provides a game theoretic justification for price leadership by the efficient or dominant firm. The traditional industrial organization literature has emphasized price leadership in general and leadership by the dominant firm in particular. Scherer and Ross (1990) point to the cigarette, steel, automobile, ready-to-eat-cereal and gasoline industries as markets where price leadership has been observed: one firm announces its price change in advance and the other firms follow. The traditional literature has emphasized that leadership allows firms to better coordinate their prices and that it results in higher prices and lower consumer surplus, thus raising possible antitrust concerns. However, that literature is not so clear on which firm will take up the leadership role. For example, Markham (1951) in his seminal paper concluded on the one hand that "... price 'leadership' in a dominant firm market is not simply a *modus operandi* designed to circumvent price competition among rival sellers but is instead an inevitable consequence of the industry's structure," while on the other hand he stated that "... in

a large number of industries which do not contain a partial monopolist, the price leader is frequently but not always the largest firm." Similarly, Scherer and Ross (1990) list as distinguishing characteristics of (barometric) price leadership "... occasional changes in the identity of the price leader (who is likely in any case to be one of the largest sellers)." We believe that the risk considerations that we stress in our paper might shed some light on these issues of price leadership in practice.

The present paper is part of a small but growing literature that aims at endogenizing and identifying the price leader. The older part of this literature (represented by Boyer and Moreaux (1987), Dowrick (1986) and Gal-Or (1985)) concludes in negative tone: unless the difference between the firms is sufficiently large, each prefers the same role, hence there is a conflict that cannot be resolved. More recent papers, however, show that such a conflict need not arise when there are capacity constraints. The reason is that the limited capacity reduces the incentive to undercut the leader's price. Deneckere and Kovenock (1992) consider price competition for homogeneous products for given exogenous capacities and show that, while the large firm is indifferent between leading and following, the small firm strictly prefers to follow. Hence, Deneckere and Kovenock (1992) conclude that the large firm will lead. Furth and Kovenock (1992) extend the study of Deneckere and Kovenock (1992) to the case of differentiated products and show that there will be agreement about the choice of roles if capacities are sufficiently asymmetric: the large firm will lead. When capacities are symmetric, however, there might be a conflict again since each player will strictly prefer the follower role. A similar result is obtained by Canoy (1996). He considers Bertrand-Edgeworth competition with differentiated goods, hence capacities are endogenously determined. He shows that when firms have different marginal costs and products are close enough substitutes, the inefficient firm will prefer to lead while the efficient firm prefers to follow, so that again no conflict arises.

In a companion paper (Van Damme and Hurkens (1996)) we consider a similar question to the one considered here for the case where firms choose quantities instead of prices. This is the case of classical Stackelberg leadership where firms might fight to

obtain the preferred role of leadership. In that case, the follower role is least preferred, each firm prefers leading to playing simultaneously and playing simultaneously to following. We focus on the case of homogeneous products with linear demand and constant marginal costs and show that risk considerations imply that also in that case the low cost firm will emerge as the leader: it is more risky for the high cost firm to commit itself to a quantity and, therefore, that firm will decide to follow. Hence, the identity of the leader is independent of whether prices or quantities are the strategic variables. The efficient firm obtains the preferred role when competition is in quantities while the inefficient firm will obtain that role when there is price competition. It should be remarked that the price competition case is easier to handle analytically than the one where competition is in quantities.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The underlying duopoly game as well as the action commitment game from Hamilton and Slutsky (1990) are described in Section 2, where also the relevant notation is introduced. Section 3 describes the specifics of the risk dominance concept (Harsanyi and Selten (1988)) as it applies to this context. The main results are derived in Section 4. Section 5 shows that a shortcut, based on risk-dominance in the restricted game where each player can only choose between committing to his leader price and waiting, would have given the wrong result and argues that this is because the restricted game does not provide a faithful description of the actual risks involved. Section 6 offers a brief conclusion.

2 The Model

The underlying linear price setting duopoly game is as follows. There are two firms, 1 and 2. Firm i produces product i at a constant marginal cost $c_i \geq 0$. The goods are imperfect substitutes and the demand for good i is given by

$$D_i(p_i, p_j) = 1 - p_i + ap_j,$$

where $0 < a < 1$. Firms choose prices simultaneously and the profit of firm i is given by $u_i(p_i, p_j) = (p_i - c_i)D_i(p_i, p_j)$. We assume that $1 > c_1 > c_2 > 0$, hence firm 2 is more

efficient than firm 1. The best reply of player j against the price p_i of player i is unique and is given by

$$b_j(p_i) = \frac{1 + ap_i + c_j}{2}. \quad (2.1)$$

The unique maximizer of the function $p_i \mapsto u_i(p_i, b_j(p_i))$ is denoted by p_i^L (firm i 's leader price). We also write p_j^F for the price that j will choose as a price follower, $p_j^F = b_j(p_i^L)$, and $L_i = u_i(p_i^L, p_j^F)$ and $F_i = u_i(p_i^F, p_j^L)$. We write (p_1^N, p_2^N) for the unique Nash equilibrium of the game and denote player i 's payoff in this equilibrium by N_i . For later reference we note that

$$p_i^L = \frac{2 + a + ac_j + (2 - a^2)c_i}{2(2 - a^2)} \quad (2.2a)$$

$$p_i^F = \frac{4 + 2a - a^2 + (4 - a^2)c_i + (2a - a^3)c_j}{4(2 - a^2)} \quad (2.2b)$$

$$p_i^N = \frac{2 + a + ac_j + 2c_i}{4 - a^2} \quad (2.2c)$$

and

$$L_i = \frac{(2 + a + ac_j + (a^2 - 2)c_i)^2}{8(2 - a^2)} \quad (2.3a)$$

$$F_i = \frac{(4 + 2a - a^2 + (2a - a^3)c_j + (3a^2 - 4)c_i)^2}{16(2 - a^2)^2} \quad (2.3b)$$

$$N_i = \frac{(2 + a + ac_j + (a^2 - 2)c_i)^2}{(4 - a^2)^2} \quad (2.3c)$$

One easily verifies that $p_1^L > p_2^L$ and $p_1^F > p_2^F$. It also readily follows that

$$p_i^L > p_i^F > p_i^N, \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

$$F_i > L_i > N_i. \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

Hence, each player has an incentive to commit himself (compared to the simultaneous play equilibrium) but prefers to follow. Straightforward computations show that $F_1 - L_1 > F_2 - L_2$, hence the high cost firm benefits more from being the follower than the low cost firm. Obviously, the above inequality is equivalent to $L_2 + F_1 > L_1 + F_2$,

hence total profits are larger when the efficient firm leads. The question we address in this paper is whether the players will succeed in reaching that “efficient” ordering of the moves.

To investigate which player will dare to wait when both players have the opportunity to do so, we make use of the *two-period action commitment game* that was proposed in Hamilton and Slutsky (1990). The rules are as follows. There are two periods and each player has to choose a price in exactly one of these periods. Within a period, choices are simultaneous, but, if a player does not choose to move in period 1, then in period 2 this player is informed about which action his opponent chose in period 1. This game has proper subgames at $t = 2$ and our assumptions imply that all of these have unique equilibria. We will analyze the reduced game, g^2 , that results when these subgames are replaced by their equilibrium values. Formally, the strategy set of player i in g^2 is $\mathbf{R}_+ \cup \{w_i\}$ and the payoff function is given by

$$u_i(p_i, p_j) = (p_i - c_i)(1 - p_i + ap_j) \quad (2.4)$$

$$u_i(p_i, w_j) = (p_i - c_i)(1 - p_i + a(1 + ap_i + c_j)/2) \quad (2.5)$$

$$u_i(w_i, p_j) = (1 + ap_j - c_i)^2/4 \quad (2.6)$$

$$u_i(w_i, w_j) = N_i \quad (2.7)$$

It is easily seen that g^2 has three Nash equilibria in pure strategies: Either each player i commits to his Nash price p_i^N in the first period, or one player i commits to his leader price p_i^L and the other player waits till the second period. It should be noted that besides these pure equilibria, the game g^2 admits mixed strategy equilibria as well. (See Pastine and Pastine (1997).) These mixed equilibria will not be considered in this paper, the reason being that we want to stick as closely as possible to the general solution procedure outlined in Harsanyi and Selten (1988), a procedure that gives precedence to pure equilibria whenever possible.¹

¹Only in the case of identical costs this is not possible, and the procedure would prescribe a mixed strategy equilibrium. It is not difficult to show that any mixed strategy equilibrium is risk dominated

Although mixed strategy equilibria will not be considered, we stress that mixed strategies will play an important role in what follows. The reason is that, in the case at hand, a player will typically be uncertain about whether the opponent will commit or not, and such uncertainty about the opponent's behavior can be expressed by a mixed strategy. Let m_j be a mixed strategy of player j in the game g^2 . Because of the linear-quadratic specification of the game, there are only three "characteristics" of m_j that are relevant to player i , viz. w_j the probability that player j waits, μ_j the average price to which j commits himself given that he commits himself, and ν_j , the variance of this price. Specifically, it easily follows from (2.4)-(2.7) that the expected payoff of player i against a mixed strategy m_j with characteristics (w_j, μ_j, ν_j) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(p_i, m_j) = & (1 - w_j)(p_i - c_i)(1 - p_i + a\mu_j) \\ & + w_j(p_i - c_i)(1 - p_i + a(1 + ap_i + c_j)/2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(w_i, m_j) = & (1 - w_j)[a^2\nu_j/4 + (1 + a\mu_j - c_i)^2/4] \\ & + w_j[(2 + a + ac_j + (a^2 - 2)c_i)/(4 - a^2)]^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Note that uncertainty concerning the price to which j will commit himself makes it more attractive for player i to wait: ν_j contributes positively to (2.9) and it does not play a role in (2.8). On the other hand, increasing w_j clearly increases the incentive for player i to commit himself. Finally, increasing μ_j increases the incentive for player i to commit himself, because of the positive effect on i 's demand.

3 Risk Dominance and the Tracing Procedure

The concept of *risk dominance* captures the intuitive idea that, when players do not know which of two equilibria should be played, they will measure the risk involved in playing each of these equilibria and they will coordinate expectations on the less risky one, i.e. on the risk dominant equilibrium of the pair. The formal definition of risk dominance involves the *bicentric prior* and the *tracing procedure*. The bicentric prior describes the

by both leadership equilibria. See Section 6 for more details.

players' initial assessment about the situation. As this initial assessment need not be an equilibrium of the game, it cannot constitute the players' final view on the situation. The tracing procedure is a process that, starting from given prior beliefs of the players, gradually adjusts the players' plans and expectations until they are in equilibrium. It models the thought process of players who, by deductive personal reflection, try to figure out what to play in the situation where the initial uncertainty is represented by the given prior. Below we describe the mechanisms of the tracing procedure as well as how, according to Harsanyi and Selten (1988), the initial prior should be constructed.

It is well known that risk dominance allows a very simple characterization for 2×2 games with two Nash equilibria: the risk dominant equilibrium is that one for which the product of the deviation losses is largest. Consequently, if risk dominance could always be decided on the basis of the reduced game spanned by the two equilibria under consideration (and if the resulting relation would be transitive), then the solution could be found by straightforward computations. Unfortunately, this happy state of affairs does not prevail in general. The two concepts do not always generate the same solution and it is well-known that the Nash product of the deviation losses may be a bad description of the underlying risk situation in general. (See, Carlsson and Van Damme (1993) for a simple example.) In Section 5 we show that this is also true for the game analyzed in this paper. In fact, the reduced game analysis produces exactly the opposite result from that obtained by applying the tracing procedure; it leads to the conclusion that the low cost firm will follow. In Section 5 we explain in detail why the reduced game offers a bad description of the risk considerations. We now proceed to formally define the concepts of the bicentric prior and the tracing procedure needed for the risk dominance analysis in the full game.

3.1 Bicentric Prior

Let $g = (S_1, S_2, u_1, u_2)$ be a 2-person game and let s and s' be two equilibria of this game. We need to specify the players' initial beliefs when they are uncertain about which of these two equilibria should be played. Harsanyi and Selten (1988) argue as follows.

Player j , being Bayesian, will assign a subjective probability z_j to i playing s_i and he will assign the complementary probability $z'_j = 1 - z_j$ to i playing s'_i . With these beliefs, player j will play the best response against the strategy $z_j s_i + z'_j s'_i$ that he expects i to play and we denote the resulting strategy of j with $b_j(z_j)$.² Player j , knowing his prior z_j , knows which action he will play. Player i , however, does not know z_j exactly and hence cannot predict exactly what j will do. Applying the principle of insufficient reason, Harsanyi and Selten (1988) argue that i will consider z_j to be uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Writing Z_j for a uniformly distributed random variable on $[0, 1]$, player i will, therefore, believe that he is facing the mixed strategy

$$m_j = b_j(Z_j) \quad (3.1)$$

and this mixed strategy m_j of player j is player i 's prior belief about j 's behavior in the situation at hand. Similarly, $m_i = b_i(Z_i)$, where Z_1 and Z_2 are independent, is the prior belief of player j , and the mixed strategy pair $m = (m_1, m_2)$ is called the *bicentric prior* associated with the pair (s, s') .

3.2 Tracing Procedure

From a mathematical point of view the tracing procedure is a mapping that maps initial beliefs into the set of equilibria of the game. In order to determine the risk dominant equilibrium we will have to apply this mapping only to the bicentric prior described above. However, in this subsection we will define the tracing procedure for any initial beliefs.

Let m_i be a mixed strategy of player i in g ($i = 1, 2$). The strategy m_i represents the initial uncertainty of player j about i 's behavior. For $t \in [0, 1]$ we define the game $g^{t,m} = (S_1, S_2, u_1^{t,m}, u_2^{t,m})$ in which the payoff functions are given by

²In general player j may have multiple best replies in which case he should play all of them with equal probability. However, in our setting with strictly quasi-concave profit functions this happens with zero probability, so we may ignore multiple best replies.

$$u_i^{t,m}(s_i, s_j) = (1-t)u_i(s_i, m_j) + tu_i(s_i, s_j). \quad (3.2)$$

Hence, for $t = 1$, this game $g^{t,m}$ coincides with the original game g , while for $t = 0$ we have a trivial game in which each player's payoff depends only on his own action and his own prior beliefs.³ Write Γ^m for the graph of the equilibrium correspondence, i.e.

$$\Gamma^m = \{(t, s) : t \in [0, 1], s \text{ is an equilibrium of } g^{t,m}\}. \quad (3.3)$$

It can be shown that, if g is a generic *finite* game, then, for almost any prior m , this graph Γ^m contains a unique distinguished curve that connects the unique equilibrium $s^{0,m}$ of $g^{0,m}$ with an equilibrium $s^{1,m}$ of $g^{1,m}$. (See Schanuel et al. (1991) for details.) The equilibrium $s^{1,m}$ is called the *linear trace* of m . If players' initial beliefs are given by m and if players' reasoning process corresponds to that as modeled by the tracing procedure, then players' expectations will converge on the equilibrium $s^{1,m}$ of g . As in our companion paper, we will apply the tracing procedure to the *infinite* game g^2 that was described in the previous section. For such games, no generalizations of the Schanuel et al. (1991) results have been established yet, but as we will see in the following section, there indeed exists a unique distinguished curve in the special case analyzed here. Hence, the non-finiteness of the game g^2 will create no special problems.

3.3 Risk Dominance

Risk dominance is defined as follows. Consider two equilibria, s and s' of g . Use the construction described in subsection 3.1 to determine the bicentric prior, m , associated

³Loosely speaking the parameter t might be thought of as time. With this interpretation, player i assigns weight $1-t$ to his prior beliefs at time t , while he gives weight t to the reasoning process at this point in time, at time $t = 1$, when the players' actions are in equilibrium, the player fully trusts the outcome of the reasoning process.

with the pair (s, s') . Then apply the tracing procedure of subsection 3.2 to m , i.e. compute the linear trace of this prior, $s^{1,m}$. We now say that s *risk dominates* s' if $s^{1,m} = s$. Similarly, s' risk dominates s if $s^{1,m} = s'$. In case the outcome of the tracing procedure is an equilibrium different from s or s' , then neither of the equilibria risk dominates the other. Such a situation will, however, not occur in our 2-stage action commitment game, provided that the costs of the firms are different.

4 Commitment and Risk Dominance

In this section, we prove our main results. Let g^2 be the endogenous commitment game from Section 2. Write S_i for the pure equilibrium in which player i commits to his leader price in period 1, $S_i = (p_i^L, w_j)$, and write B for the equilibrium in which each player commits to his Bertrand price in period 1, $B = (p_1^N, p_2^N)$. We show that both price leader equilibria risk dominate the Nash equilibrium and that S_2 risk dominates S_1 when $c_2 < c_1$. The first result is quite intuitive: Committing to p_i^N is a weakly dominated strategy and playing a weakly dominated strategy is risky. The proof of this result is correspondingly easy.

Proposition 1 *In g^2 , the price leader equilibrium S_i risk dominates the Nash equilibrium B ($i = 1, 2$).*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we just prove that S_1 risk dominates B . We first compute the bicentric prior that is relevant for this risk comparison, starting with the prior beliefs of player 1.

Let player 2 believe that 1 plays $z_2 S_{11} + (1 - z_2) B_1 = z_2 p_1^L + (1 - z_2) p_1^N$. Obviously, if $z_2 \in (0, 1)$, then the unique best response of player 2 is to wait, $b_2(z_2) = w_2$. Hence, the prior belief of player 1 is that player 2 will wait with probability 1, $m_2 = w_2$.

Next, let player 1 believe that 2 plays $z_1 S_{12} + (1 - z_1) B_2 = z_1 w_2 + (1 - z_1) p_2^N$. Obviously, waiting yields player 1 the Nash payoff N_1 as in (2.3c), irrespective of the value of z_1 . When $z_1 > 0$ then committing to a price that is (slightly) above p_1^N yields a strictly higher

payoff, hence, the best response is to commit to a certain price $p_1(z_1)$, $b_1(z_1) = p_1(z_1)$. The reader easily verifies that $p_1(z_1)$ increases with z_1 and that $p_1(1) = p_1^L$. Consequently, if m_1 is the prior belief of player 2 then for the characteristics (w_1, μ_1, ν_1) of m_1 we have: $w_1 = 0$, $\mu_1 > p_1^N$, $\nu_1 > 0$.

Now, let us turn to the tracing procedure. The starting point corresponds to the best replies against the prior. Obviously, the unique best response against m_2 is for player 1 to commit to p_1^L , while player 2's unique best response against m_1 is to wait. Hence, the unique equilibrium at $t = 0$ is S_1 . Since S_1 is an equilibrium of the original game, it is an equilibrium for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Consequently, the distinguished curve in the graph Γ^m is the curve $\{(t, S_1) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ and S_1 risk dominates B . \square

We now turn to the risk comparison of the two price leader equilibria. Again we start by computing the bicentric prior based on S_1 and S_2 . We show that each player's prior belief is that the other player will commit to a random price. Let player j believe that i commits to p_i^L with probability z and that i waits with probability $1 - z$. Waiting yields

$$u_j(w_j, zp_i^L + (1 - z)w_i) = zF_j + (1 - z)N_j.$$

It is easily seen that committing to the follower price p_j^F results in higher profits, namely the mapping $p \mapsto u_j(p, b_i(p))$ is concave and attains its maximum at p_j^L , and since $p_j^F \in (p_j^N, p_j^L)$, we have

$$u_j(p_j^F, b_i(p_j^F)) > u_j(p_j^N, b_i(p_j^N)) = N_j,$$

so that

$$u_j(p_j^F, zp_i^L + (1 - z)w_i) > u_j(w_j, zp_i^L + (1 - z)w_i).$$

Hence, it already follows that each player will believe that the opponent will commit himself to some price. To determine this price, note that committing to price p_j yields

$$u_j(p_j, zp_i^L + (1 - z)w_i) = (p_j - c_j)[1 - p_j + a(zp_i^L + (1 - z)(1 + ap_j + c_i)/2)].$$

Given z , the optimal commitment price $p_j(z)$ of player j must satisfy the first order condition $\partial u_j(p_j, zp_i^L + (1 - z)w_i)/\partial p_j = 0$, and is, hence, given by

$$p_j(z) = \frac{(1-z)(2-a^2)p_j^L + 2zp_j^F}{2-a^2(1-z)}. \quad (4.1)$$

Consequently, both players expect the other player to commit with probability one. Furthermore, note that $p_1(z) > p_2(z)$ for all $z \in [0, 1]$, since $p_1^L > p_2^L$ and $p_1^F > p_2^F$. This means that firm 1 expects firm 2 to commit to a low price, while firm 2 expects firm 1 to commit to a high price. From

$$p'_j(z) = \frac{2(2-a^2)(p_j^F - p_j^L)}{(2-a^2(1-z))^2},$$

one easily verifies that $p'_2(z) < p'_1(z) < 0$ since $p_2^F - p_2^L < p_1^F - p_1^L < 0$. Hence, firm 2's price is expected to vary more than firm 1's price. (See Appendix A1 for a formal proof.) We summarize these results in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1 *Player i 's bicentric prior m_j is that j will commit to a random price $p_j(z)$ with expectation μ_j and variance ν_j , where $\mu_j \in (p_j^F, p_j^L)$ and $\nu_j > 0$. Moreover, we have $\mu_1 > \mu_2$ and $\nu_1 < \nu_2$.*

Now, let us turn to the tracing procedure. The starting point (the initial equilibrium) corresponds to the best reply against the prior. Since both players expect the other to commit with probability one and are uncertain about the exact price the opponent will commit to, the unique best reply for both players is to wait. As t increases player i attaches more and more weight (namely t) to the event that player j will wait. At some critical point \bar{t}_i it must become profitable to commit and take the leader role. We will show that the low cost firm will switch before the high cost firm will, i.e. that $\bar{t}_1 > \bar{t}_2$. The intuition is given by Lemma 1 and the equations (2.8) and (2.9): Since player 1 (the high cost firm) commits to a higher and less variable price, it is relatively more attractive for firm 2 to commit to a price. We elaborate below and relegate the formal proof to the Appendix.

Recall from Section 2 that the expected payoff of player i depends only on his action and the three important characteristics of the opponent's (mixed) strategy, viz. the

probability that the other player waits, the average price to which the other player commits himself (given that he commits himself), and the variance of that price. During the tracing procedure expectations about the opponent's strategy change (see section 3.2), but as long as no player switches away from waiting, only the probability that the other waits will be adjusted. The average commitment price and the variation of this price do not change. Hence, the expectation of player i at time t , given that no one has switched yet, is given by the mixed strategy $m_j^t = (1-t)m_j + tw_j$. Identifying this mixed strategy with its important characteristics we will write $m_j^t = (t, \mu_j, \nu_j)$. The expected payoff for player i from committing and waiting is given in (2.8) and (2.9), respectively. For $m^t = (t, \mu, \nu)$ define the gain from committing for i as

$$g_i(m^t) = \max_{p_i} u_i(p_i, m^t) - u_i(w_i, m^t).$$

We will show that firm 2 always has a higher incentive to commit himself than firm 1, i.e. that $g_2(m_1^t) > g_1(m_2^t)$ for all t . Since the gain of committing is negative at $t = 0$ and positive at $t = 1$, this implies that firm 2 will switch before firm 1 does.

The formal proof is divided into three steps and is given in the Appendix. We now provide intuition for each step. In the first step we show that the gain from committing is increasing in the opponent's price. From equations (2.4) and (2.6) it follows in a straightforward manner that

$$\frac{\partial u_i(p_i, p_j)}{\partial p_j} = a(p_i - c_i)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u_i(w_i, p_j)}{\partial p_j} = a(b_i(p_j) - c_i),$$

i.e. the marginal effect on i 's profit of an increase in j 's price is equal to the price-cost margin multiplied with the marginal increase in demand. Since j will never commit to a price above p_j^L , $b_i(p_j) < p_i^F$. On the other hand, if firm i commits himself he will (optimally) commit to a price above p_i^F . The effect of an increase in p_j is thus larger when i commits himself than when he waits.

Secondly, the gain from committing is decreasing in the variability of the price of the opponent. This is very intuitive. We know from Lemma 1 that $\nu_1 < \nu_2$ so that firm 1

is more uncertain about the price firm 2 will commit himself to. Clearly, this gives him more reason to wait and less to commit.

Finally, we show that the low cost firm has more incentive to commit than a high cost firm even if they have exactly the same expectation about the commitment price of the opponent. This follows from the fact that the high cost firm gains more from being the follower than the low cost firm, i.e. that $F_1 - L_1 > F_2 - L_2$. The above steps can now be combined to show that, with μ_k and ν_k as in Lemma 1 we get

$$g_2(t, \mu_1, \nu_1) > g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_1) > g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_2) > g_1(t, \mu_2, \nu_2). \quad (4.2)$$

The formal proof is in Appendix A2. The above inequalities imply that at any point in the tracing procedure player 2 gains more from committing than firm 1, and, therefore, it must be player 2 who will decide to switch first, i.e. $\bar{t}_1 > \bar{t}_2$. Thus, both players wait till \bar{t}_2 at which point player 2 is exactly indifferent between waiting and committing optimally (to $\tilde{p}_2(\bar{t}_2)$). The graph of the equilibrium correspondence exhibits a “vertical” segment at t_2 . Any pair of strategies in which firm 1 waits and firm 2 mixes between waiting (with probability w) and committing to $\tilde{p}_2(\bar{t}_2)$ (with probability $1 - w$) is an equilibrium of $g^{\bar{t}_2, m}$: Firm 2 is indifferent and any mixture is therefore a best reply. Firm 1 strictly prefers to wait when $w = 1$ (since $g_1(m_2^{\bar{t}_2}) < g_2(m_1^{\bar{t}_2}) = 0$) and also when $w = 0$ (since then firm 2 commits for sure to a random price). Because of linearity (in w) firm 1 prefers to wait for any $w \in [0, 1]$. From \bar{t}_2 onward, player 2 commits with probability 1 (but changes the commitment price continuously) and player 1 waits with probability 1. Therefore, the tracing procedure ends up in an equilibrium where player 2 commits and player 1 waits, i.e. at S_2 . This concludes the proof of

Proposition 2 *The price leader equilibrium S_2 in which the low cost firm leads risk dominates the one in which the high cost firm leads.*

By combining the Propositions 1 and 2 we, therefore, obtain our main result:

Theorem 1 *The price leader equilibrium in which the efficient firm leads and the inefficient firm follows is the risk dominant equilibrium of the endogenous price commitment game.*

Note that, if the costs of firm 1 are not much higher than the costs of firm 2, then $F_1 > L_2$, i.e. the high cost firm makes higher profits (as a price follower) in the risk dominant equilibrium than the efficient firm (as a price leader). This seems curious and counterintuitive at first sight since it could give incentives to the low cost firm to increase its cost (if he would be able to do that in a credible way). However, given the cost structure, waiting is less risky for a high cost firm than for a low cost firm, and the inefficient firm profits from its “weak” position.

5 Risk Dominance in the Reduced Game

We recall that risk dominance allows a very simple characterization for 2×2 games with two Nash equilibria: the risk dominant equilibrium is that one for which the product of the deviation losses is largest. Consequently, if risk dominance could always be decided on the basis of the reduced game spanned by the two equilibria under consideration (and if the resulting relation would be transitive), then the solution could be found by straightforward computations. Let us perform these computations based on the reduced game where each player is restricted to either committing himself to his leader’s price or to wait, which is given by Table 1

	p_2^L	w_2
p_1^L	D_1, D_2	L_1, F_2
w_1	F_1, L_2	N_1, N_2

Table 1: Reduced version of the price commitment game.

where L_i , N_i and F_i are as in (2.3) and where $D_i = u_i(p_i^L, p_j^L)$ denotes player i ’s payoff in the case of price leader warfare.⁴ It is easily verified that

$$L_i - N_i = \frac{a^4(2 + a + ac_j + (a^2 - 2)c_i)^2}{8(2 - a^2)(4 - a^2)^2} \quad (5.1)$$

⁴The term “warfare” is somewhat misplaced here since the corresponding payoffs are higher than the payoffs of the usual price leader, i.e. $D_i > L_i$.

$$F_j - D_j = \frac{a^4(1 + ac_i - c_j)^2}{16(a^2 - 2)^2} \quad (5.2)$$

It follows that the product of deviation losses at S_1 is larger than at S_2 if and only if

$$(c_1 - c_2)(2 + 2a + (c_1 + c_2)(a^2 - 1)) > 0 \quad (5.3)$$

which clearly holds since $c_1 > c_2$. Risk considerations based on reduced game analysis unambiguously point into the direction of the price leader equilibrium where the high cost firm leads. We see that the result based on the reduced game is the opposite of our result established in the previous section, which was based on the full commitment game.

Two issues arise here: First, the relevance of the 2×2 game, and second, the characterization of risk dominance in 2×2 games. The result that the risk dominant equilibrium is the one at which the product of deviation losses is largest was proved by Harsanyi and Selten (1988, Lemma 5.4.4). To enable the reader a proper evaluation of our work it is convenient to reproduce their argument here. Consider the generic 2×2 game from Table 2,

	L	R
T	a_{11}, b_{11}	a_{12}, b_{12}
B	a_{21}, b_{21}	a_{22}, b_{22}

Table 2: A generic 2×2 game.

where $a_{11} > a_{21}$, $b_{11} > b_{12}$, $a_{22} > a_{12}$, and $b_{22} > b_{21}$ so that both (T, L) and (B, R) are pure strict Nash equilibria. Denote by \bar{z}_j the probability with which player j chooses his first strategy in the mixed equilibrium. Then it is easily seen that the prior belief of player j (as outlined in Section 3) assigns probability $1 - \bar{z}_j$ to i playing his first strategy. Assume that $\bar{z}_1 + \bar{z}_2 < 1$. Then each player's best reply against his prior is his first strategy, hence the tracing procedure for determining the risk dominant equilibrium starts at (T, L) and stays there: (T, L) risk dominates (B, R) . Similarly, (B, R) is risk dominant if $\bar{z}_1 + \bar{z}_2 > 1$. Now it is easily verified that $\bar{z}_1 + \bar{z}_2 < 1$ if and only if

$$(a_{11} - a_{21})(b_{11} - b_{12}) > (b_{22} - b_{21})(a_{22} - a_{12}),$$

i.e. if the product of deviation losses at (T, L) is larger than the product of deviation losses at (B, R) .

In order to illustrate why the reduced game analysis and the full game analysis give different solutions, let us reconsider the bicentric prior in both approaches in a numerical example with extreme values of the parameters. In particular, suppose $a = 1$, $c_1 = 1$, and $c_2 = 0$. Substituting these values into (2.2a) and (2.2b) yields $p_1^L = p_1^F = p_2^L = 2$ and $p_2^F = 3/2$. This implies that $D_1 = F_1$ so that in the reduced game of Table 1, committing to p_1^L is a weakly dominant strategy for player 1. Clearly, this means that waiting is extremely risky for firm 1 and he will, therefore, be the leader in the risk dominant equilibrium. (More formally, the product of deviation losses at S_2 is zero while it is positive at S_1 .)

Now reconsider the full commitment game analyzed in Section 4. If player 1 believes that 2 will commit to p_2^L with probability z and will wait with probability $1 - z$, his best reply is to commit to $p_1(z) = 2$ for all z . Hence, player 2's prior is that player 1 will commit for sure to the price 2. On the other hand, player 1's prior is that player 2 will commit to some random price between $3/2$ and 2. The best replies against the bicentric prior are, therefore, that player 1 waits and that player 2 commits to $p_2^F = 3/2$. During the tracing procedure the beliefs that 1 will wait and that 2 will commit to a random price are reinforced, and the linear trace must be S_2 .

For general parameters the differences between the two approaches are not as clear-cut as with the extreme numbers used above, but the differences are still remarkable. In particular, in the full game analysis both firms believe that the other will commit for sure and, therefore, their initial best replies are to wait. In the reduced game both firms attach positive weight to the event that the other will wait. However, the high cost firm attaches a high probability to the event that the low cost firm will wait, whereas the low cost firm only assigns low probability to the event that the high cost firm will wait. The best replies are, therefore, for the inefficient firm to commit and for the efficient firm to wait. See Table 3 below.

	Prior beliefs about		Initial equilibrium strategies of	
	player 1	player 2	player 1	player 2
Full Game	commit	commit	wait	wait
Reduced Game	likely to commit	likely to wait	commit	wait

Table 3: Comparing the two approaches.

We see that the two approaches differ in two respects: they produce different priors and the best replies against the priors are different. The artificial reduction of the game restricts players in their choices and forces them to do things they do not really want to do. In particular, it forces players to wait, if that is better than committing to the leader price, while we have seen that committing to the follower price always generates a higher payoff than waiting. Harsanyi and Selten (1988) emphasize that the computations should take into account all strategies that are best replies against some mixture between the two equilibrium strategies, and not only the two equilibrium strategies. To further illustrate why the 2×2 game describes the risk considerations very badly we will now consider the 3×3 game of Table 4

	p_2^L	p_2^F	w_2
p_1^L	D_1, D_2	L_1, F_2	L_1, F_2
p_1^F	F_1, L_2	X_1, X_2	Y_1, Z_2
w_1	F_1, L_2	Z_1, Y_2	N_1, N_2

Table 4: Another reduced version of the price commitment game.

where L_i , N_i , F_i and D_i are as in Table 1 and $X_i = u_i(p_i^F, p_j^F)$, $Y_i = u_i(p_i^F, b_j(p_j^F))$, and $Z_i = u_i(b_i(p_j^F), p_j^F)$. In this game players are restricted to commit to the leader price, to commit to the follower price or to wait. Of course, in this game players are still quite restricted in their choices (as compared to the full game) but we will see that just allowing players to use one very natural strategy, namely committing to the follower price, already upsets the result of the 2×2 game.

Since $N_i < Y_i$, the reader easily verifies that the prior attaches positive weight only to p_i^L and p_i^F . In fact, using the quadratic payoff structure of the game it can be established that both players attach exactly the same weight to the event that the opponent will commit to the leader price. Clearly, for both players the best reply against the initial prior is to wait, as in the analysis of the full game and as opposed to what happens in the 2×2 game. In order to compute the risk dominant equilibrium we have to determine again who will switch first as players attach more weight to the event that the other player will wait. It turns out that, if we would not allow the players to switch to the follower price (as in the 2×2 game), player 1 would switch first and become the price leader. However, in the 3×3 game players want to switch away from their waiting strategy to the safer follower price at a much earlier point in time. Each player will switch from waiting to his follower price when he becomes exactly indifferent between these strategies. Since these strategies yield the same payoff in case the other commits to his leader price, the time at which players want to switch is determined by the payoffs in the 2×2 game at the bottom right corner of the game of Table 4. Straightforward computations yield that in fact player 2 will switch first. Hence, in the game of Table 4 the equilibrium in which the low cost firm is the price leader and the high cost firm follows is risk dominant, as in the full game.⁵

To summarize, there are three objections against the shortcut analysis of the 2×2 game. First, the reduced game does not take into account all strategies that are best replies for some initial subjective beliefs. Second, this implies that the bicentric prior computed in that game is not the right one. In the full game firms are always uncertain about the commitment price of the opponent and, therefore, prefer to wait. Finally, even if we would construct the bicentric prior based on the full game, but again use the 2×2 game to determine who will switch first and become the price leader, we will get the wrong result. If firms can only commit to the leader price, the high cost firm would

⁵For example, for parameters $a = 0.5$, $c_1 = 0.75$ and $c_2 = 0.25$ we find that player 1 would switch to his follower price at $t = 0.12$ and to his leader price at $t = 0.41$. For player 2 these values are, respectively, $t = 0.01$ and $t = 0.48$.

switch first. However, firms would switch earlier if they could use a safer strategy, like committing to the follower price. Given that opportunity, the low cost firm will switch first and become the price leader.

6 Conclusion

In this paper we studied the strategic choice of whether to lead or to follow in a duopoly price competition game with symmetrically horizontally differentiated products and where the firms differ in their marginal costs. We analysed a model in which firms can decide to move early or late. The model has two pure equilibria corresponding to the two possible role assignments and by using the risk dominance criterion we were able to select among these. Specifically, as waiting is more risky for the efficient firm than for the firm with the higher cost, the former will act as a price leader and the latter will occupy the more preferred role. Note that this does not necessarily imply that the largest firm will lead. The efficient firm has the largest market share if and only if he charges the lowest price and whether this holds depends on the extent to which the costs differ. If the cost difference is small the efficient leader will have the higher price (hence the smaller market share) and if the difference is large it will have the lowest price (and the larger market share). So our results are in line with the empirical observation that the price leader is often, but not always, the larger firm.⁶

As compared to the alternative candidate solution, where the least efficient firm leads, the total profits in the risk dominant equilibrium are higher (since $L_2 + F_1 > L_1 + F_2$), the division of the profits is more equal ($|L_1 - F_2| < |L_2 - F_1|$) and consumer surplus is lower. To see why, consider first the case where $p_1^L > p_1^F > p_2^L > p_2^F$. Since $p_2^L - p_2^F > p_1^L - p_1^F$ one sees that when we go from S_2 to S_1 , the price decrease of good 2 is larger than the price increase of good 1. Since consumers buy more of good 2 than of good 1, this means that the bundle consumed under S_2 can be bought under S_1 for less money, which of course implies that consumers are better off when firm 1 is the leader. The

⁶If the inefficient firm were to lead, it would certainly have the smaller market share because it sets the highest price, $p_1^L > p_2^F$.

argument for the other case where $p_1^L > p_2^L > p_1^F > p_2^F$ is similar. First note that the goods are completely symmetric so that consumers are indifferent between the situation of S_2 and the situation in which firm 1 charges p_2^L and firm 2 charges p_1^F . If we compare the latter situation with S_1 we see that, since $p_1^F - p_2^F > p_1^L - p_2^L$, the price decrease of good 2 is larger than the price increase of good 1 so that again consumers prefer firm 1 to lead.

The conclusion that the efficient firm will move first appears to be robust. In our companion paper (Van Damme and Hurkens (1996)) we derive it for the case of quantity competition, Deneckere and Kovenock (1992) obtained it for the case of capacity-constrained price competition and homogeneous goods, and Cabrales et al (1997) derived the result for the case of vertical product differentiation, where firms first choose qualities and next compete in prices. This latter paper also makes use of the concept of risk dominance, but it does not derive the result analytically; instead the authors resort to numerical computations and simulations. To our knowledge, the present paper, together with its companion on quantity competition, are the first applications of the (linear) tracing procedure to games where the strategy spaces are not finite. We have seen that, although there may be some computational complexities, no new conceptual difficulties are encountered. Of course, more important than this methodological aspect is the apparent robustness result itself, which might provide the theoretical underpinning for the observed phenomenon in practise that frequently the dominant firm indeed acts as the leader (Scherer and Ross (1990)).

Note that we did not provide the solution of the endogenous timing game for the case where both firms have the same marginal costs. The reader might conjecture that in that case the Bertrand equilibrium would be selected, i.e. that firms would move simultaneously, however, that conjecture is wrong. Clearly, if the firms are completely symmetric, none of the price leader equilibria can risk dominate the other. Harsanyi and Selten (1988) argue that in that case the solution of the game is the linear trace of the barycentric prior $\frac{1}{2}p_i^L + \frac{1}{2}w_i$. In Appendix A3 we show that the linear trace of this prior is a mixed strategy equilibrium M where firms commit with positive probability

to some price $p^M \in (p^N, p^L)$ and wait with the remaining probability. (See Pastine and Pastine (1997) for details about this mixed equilibrium.) The intuition that we do not end up at the Bertrand equilibrium is simple: if the tracing path would converge there then each player would have an incentive to wait (because each firm would expect the other to commit to a random price) and that cannot be an equilibrium.

We do not find this mixed equilibrium solution very appealing. For example, we note that this equilibrium is risk dominated by any of the price leader equilibria. Compare for example this mixed equilibrium with S_1 . For $z \in (0, 1)$ the unique best reply for player 2 against $zM + (1 - z)S_1$ is to wait (since waiting is a best reply against both equilibria). On the other hand, the best reply for player 1 is to commit, since committing to $b_1(p^M)$ is strictly better than waiting. So the bicentric prior is that 2 will wait and 1 will commit. Hence, the tracing procedure ends up at S_1 , which means that S_1 risk dominates M . Furthermore, the fully symmetric case is clearly very special and the mixed equilibrium solution is driven by the complete symmetry. We note that any small perturbation will get rid of this solution. Either the costs will be slightly different, and then we are back in the case analyzed in Section 4, or, alternatively, there is a small tremble in the prior that is used in the tracing procedure. It can be shown that such a tremble would always lead to one of the price leader equilibria.⁷ Such lack of robustness does not exist if costs are asymmetric to start with: Small perturbations in the prior will not change the outcome.

The main result of this paper also does not depend on the assumption that there are only two points in time when the prices can potentially be chosen. Assume that the market opens at time $t = 0$, but that firms could fix their price at any time point $t = 0, -1, -2, \dots, -T$, with players being committed to a price once it has been chosen and with players being fully informed about the past history.⁸ The solution may be

⁷We would like to thank Andreu Mas-Colell for pointing our attention to this issue.

⁸This game is analyzed by Robson (1990), where however it is assumed that moving early is associated with higher cost: each firm incurs additional cost $c(t)$ when it moves at time t , where $c(\cdot)$ is decreasing and converging to ∞ as t tends to $-\infty$. It is easily seen that, provided $c(t) - c(t+1)$ is sufficiently small, the game only has equilibria in which players move in different periods. If both players prefer to lead

determined by backwards induction, i.e. by applying the subgame consistency principle from Harsanyi and Selten (1988). It is common knowledge that, once the game reaches time $t = -1$ with no commitments being made, the efficient firm will commit to p_2^t while the high cost firm will wait. Knowing this, at $t < -1$, both players find it in their interest to wait. The predicted outcome, hence, is not sensitive to the number of commitment periods: both firms will make their price announcements only shortly before the market opens, with the efficient firm making the announcement slightly earlier.

References

- Boyer, M. and M. Moreaux (1987). "Being a Leader or a Follower: Reflections on the Distribution of Roles in Duopoly," *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **5**, 175-192.
- Cabrales, A., Garcia-Fontes, W. and M. Motta (1997). "Risk Dominance Selects the Leader. An Experimental Analysis." Economics Working Paper 222, UPF.
- Canoy, M. (1996). "Product Differentiation in a Bertrand-Edgeworth Duopoly," *Journal of Economic Theory* **70**, 158-179.
- Carlsson, H. and E. Van Damme (1993). "Equilibrium Selection in Stag Hunt Games," in K. Binmore and A. Kirman (ed.) *Frontiers in Game Theory*, MIT Press, 237-254.
- van Damme, E. and S. Hurkens (1996). "Endogenous Stackelberg Leadership," Economics Working Paper 190, UPF.
- Deneckere, R.J. and D. Kovenock (1992). "Price Leadership," *Review of Economic Studies* **59**, 143-162.

then in the unique subgame perfect equilibrium that player i for which $L_i - F_i$ is largest will emerge as the leader and he will commit approximately at the time where $L_j - F_j = c(t)$. If both players prefer to follow (as in the model of the present paper), the game has two subgame perfect equilibria: one player will commit at $t = -1$, while the other will wait till $t = 0$. In this case Robson (1990) cannot determine which of these equilibria will result.

- Dowrick, S. (1986). "Von Stackelberg and Cournot Duopoly: Choosing Roles," *Rand Journal of Economics* **17**, 251-260.
- Furth, D. and D. Kovenock (1992). "Price Leadership in a Duopoly with Capacity Constraints and Product Differentiation," *Journal of Economics*, **57**, 1-35.
- Gal-Or, E. (1985). "First Mover and Second Mover Advantages," *International Economic Review*, **26**, 649-653.
- Hamilton, J.H. and S.M. Slutsky (1990). "Endogenous timing in duopoly games: Stackelberg or Cournot equilibria," *Games and Economic Behavior* **2**, 29-46.
- Harsanyi, J. and R. Selten (1988). *A General Theory of Equilibrium Selection in Games*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Markham, J.W. (1951). "The Nature and Significance of Price Leadership," *American Economic Review* **41**, 891-905.
- Pastine, I. and T. Pastine (1997). "Endogenous Price Leadership as a War of Attrition," mimeo Bilkent University.
- Robson, A.J. (1990). "Duopoly with Endogenous Strategic Timing: Stackelberg regained," *International Economic Review* **31**, 263-274.
- Schanuel, S.H., L.K. Simon and W.R. Zame (1991). "The Algebraic Geometry of Games and the Tracing Procedure", in: R. Selten (ed.), *Game Equilibrium Models, Vol. 2: Methods, Morals and Markets*, Springer Verlag, 9-43.
- Scherer, F.M. and D. Ross (1990), *Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance*. Third Edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Von Stackelberg, H. (1934). *Marktform und Gleichgewicht*, Springer Verlag, Vienna and Berlin.

Appendix

A1

Let $Z \sim \text{Un}(0, 1)$, $Z_i = p_i(Z)$ and $\nu_i = \text{Var}(Z_i)$. We need to prove $\nu_1 < \nu_2$. We will only use that $p'_2(z) < p'_1(z) < 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nu_1 - \nu_2 &= \int_0^1 p_1(z)^2 dz - \left[\int_0^1 p_1(z) dz \right]^2 - \int_0^1 p_2(z)^2 dz + \left[\int_0^1 p_2(z) dz \right]^2 \\
 &= \int_0^1 [p_1(z)^2 - p_2(z)^2] dz - (\mu_1^2 - \mu_2^2) \\
 &= \int_0^1 [(p_1(z) - p_2(z))(p_1(z) + p_2(z))] dz - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)(\mu_1 + \mu_2) \\
 &= \int_0^1 [p_1(z) - p_2(z)][p_1(z) + p_2(z) - \mu_1 - \mu_2] dz \\
 &= \left[(p_1(z) - p_2(z)) \left(\int_0^z [p_1(t) + p_2(t) - \mu_1 - \mu_2] dt \right) \right]_0^1 \\
 &\quad - \int_0^1 [p'_1(z) - p'_2(z)] \left[\int_0^z (p_1(t) + p_2(t) - \mu_1 - \mu_2) dt \right] dz \\
 &= 0 - \int_0^1 [p'_1(z) - p'_2(z)] \left[\int_0^z (p_1(t) + p_2(t) - \mu_1 - \mu_2) dt \right] dz
 \end{aligned}$$

The first factor within the integral is positive. It suffices to show that the second factor is also nonnegative. Well, the second factor is equal to zero for $z = 0$ and for $z = 1$. The result follows once we have shown that the second factor is a concave function of z . The first derivative of the second factor (with respect to z) is

$$-\mu_1 + p_1(z) - \mu_2 + p_2(z)$$

and the second derivative is

$$p'_1(z) + p'_2(z) < 0.$$

□

A2

We prove the three inequalities in (4.2).

$$(i) \ g_2(t, \mu_1, \nu_1) > g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_1).$$

Proof. Given expectations $m^t = (t, \mu, \nu)$, the optimal commitment price, $\tilde{p}_i(t)$ can be easily computed. The computations are almost identical to the derivation of $p_j(z)$ in (4.1), and one finds

$$\tilde{p}_i(t) = \frac{2(1-t)b_i(\mu) + t(2-a^2)p_i^L}{2-a^2t}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

If $\mu < p_j^L$ then $b_i(\mu) < p_i^F < p_i^L$ and it follows that $\tilde{p}_i(t) \geq b_i(\mu)$. Using the theorem of the maximum, one now easily verifies that

$$\frac{\partial g_i(m^t)}{\partial \mu} = a(1-t)(\tilde{p}_i(t) - b_i(\mu)) \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Since $p_1^L > \mu_1 > \mu_2$ we have that $\tilde{p}_2(t) \geq b_2(\mu_1) \geq b_2(\mu_2)$. It follows from (A.2) that

$$g_2(t, \mu_1, \nu_1) > g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_1).$$

□

(ii) $g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_1) > g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_2)$.

Proof. Again using the theorem of the maximum, one finds

$$\frac{\partial g_i(m^t)}{\partial \nu} = -(1-t)a^2/4 < 0. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Since $\nu_1 < \nu_2$, it follows from (A.3) that

$$g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_1) > g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_2).$$

□

(iii) $g_2(t, \mu_2, \nu_2) > g_1(t, \mu_2, \nu_2)$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_i(t, \mu, \nu)}{\partial c_i} &= -(1-t)(1 - \tilde{p}_i(t) + a\mu) - t(1 - \tilde{p}_i(t) + a(1 + a\tilde{p}_i(t) + c_j)/2) \\ &\quad + (1-t)(1 + a\mu - c_i)/2 - t \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial c_i} \\ &= \tilde{p}_i(t) - b_i(\mu) + t \left\{ \frac{a\mu - 1 + c_i - a(1 + a\tilde{p}_i(t) + c_j)}{2} - \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial c_i} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the derivative of the right-hand side with respect to t yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial c_i} \right) &= (1 - a^2 t / 2) \tilde{p}'(t) + \frac{a\mu - 1 + c_i - a(1 + a\tilde{p}_i(t) + c_j)}{2} - \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial c_i} \\ &= \frac{a(-16 + 8a^2 - 2a^3 - 2a^4 + 2a^3 c_i - a^5 c_i - a^4 c_j)}{4(4 - a^2)^2} < 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial c_i}(t, \mu, \nu) \leq \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial c_i}(0, \mu, \nu) = 0.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_i(t, \mu, \nu)}{\partial c_j} &= t(\tilde{p}_i(t) - c_i)a/2 - t \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial c_j} \\ &= t(\tilde{p}_i(t) - c_i)a/2 - 2at \frac{(p_i^N - c_i)}{4 - a^2} \\ &= \frac{at}{2(4 - a^2)} \left\{ (4 - a^2)(\tilde{p}_i(t) - c_i) - 4(p_i^N - c_i) \right\} \\ &> \frac{at}{2(4 - a^2)} \left\{ (4 - a^2)((b_i(\mu) - c_i) - 4(p_i^N - c_i)) \right\} \\ &= \frac{at}{2(4 - a^2)} (a^2 c_i + 4(b_i(\mu) - p_i^N)) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

The gain of committing for player i is decreasing in c_i and increasing in c_j . Hence,

$$g_2(m_2|c_1, c_2) \geq g_2(m_2|c_2, c_1) = g_1(m_2|c_1, c_2) = g_1(m_2).$$

□

A3

We show that when firms have identical costs the Harsanyi/Selten solution of the endogenous timing game is a mixed equilibrium in which firms are indifferent between committing and waiting and not the pure equilibrium in which firms commit themselves to the Bertrand equilibrium.

Let $m = \frac{1}{2}p^L + \frac{1}{2}w$ be the barycentric prior. Suppose that for t sufficiently close to 1 the equilibrium of $g^{t,m}$ is $x(t) = (1 - w(t))p(t) + w(t)w$, i.e. each firm waits with probability $w(t)$ and commits with probability $(1 - w(t))$ to $p(t)$. Hence, at t players' expectations are given by $m^t = (1 - t)m + tx(t)$. Consider the derivative with respect to

t of the gain function $g(m^t)$. Because of the envelope theorem the effect of the (optimal) commitment price cancels out and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dt}g(m^t) &= \frac{\partial g(m^t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial g(m^t)}{\partial w}w'(t) \\
 &= (p(t) - c)a \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}p^L - \frac{1}{2}\frac{1 + ap(t) + c}{2} + (1 - w(t))p(t) + w(t)\frac{1 + ap(t) + c}{2} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + tw'(t)\left(\frac{1 + ap(t) + c}{2} - p(t)\right) \right\} \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2}F + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1 + ap(t) - c}{2}\right)^2 - (1 - w(t))\left(\frac{1 + ap(t) - c}{2}\right)^2 - w(t)N \\
 &\quad - tw'(t)\left(N - \left(\frac{1 + ap(t) - c}{2}\right)^2\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

If at $t = 1$ we would have $w(1) = 0$ and $p(1) = p^N$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left(\frac{d}{dt}g(m^t)\right)_{|t=1} &= (p^N - c)a\left(-\frac{1}{2}p^L - \frac{1}{2}p^N + p^N\right) + \frac{1}{2}F + \frac{1}{2}N - N \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}(a(p^N - c)(p^N - p^L) + F - N) \\
 &= \frac{1}{4}a(p^L - p^N)(p^F - p^N) > 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Since at $t = 1$ the gain to commit is zero, this means that firms will strictly prefer to wait at $t < 1$. Hence, the outcome of the tracing procedure cannot be the Bertrand equilibrium and must be a non-degenerate mixed strategy equilibrium. \square

No.	Author(s)	Title
9798	V. Bhaskar and E. van Damme	Moral Hazard and Private Monitoring
9799	F. Palomino	Relative Performance Equilibrium in Financial Markets
97100	G. Gürkan and A.Y. Özge	Functional Properties of Throughput in Tandem Lines with Unreliable Servers and Finite Buffers
97101	E.G.A. Gaury, J.P.C. Kleijnen and H. Pierreval	Configuring a Pull Production-Control Strategy Through a Generic Model
97102	F.A. de Roon, Th.E. Nijman and C. Veld	Analyzing Specification Errors in Models for Futures Risk Premia with Hedging Pressure
97103	M. Berg, R. Brekelmans and A. De Waegenare	Budget Setting Strategies for the Company's Divisions
97104	C. Fernández and M.F.J. Steel	Reference Priors for Non-Normal Two-Sample Problems
97105	C. Fernández and M.F.J. Steel	Reference Priors for the General Location-Scale Model
97106	M.C.W. Janssen and E. Maasland	On the Unique D1 Equilibrium in the Stackelberg Model with asymmetric information
97107	A. Belke and M. Göcke	Multiple Equilibria in German Employment -Simultaneous Identification of Structural Breaks-
97108	D. Bergemann and U. Hege	Venture Capital Financing, Moral Hazard, and Learning
97109	U. Hege and P. Viala	Contentious Contracts
97110	P.J.-J. Herings	A Note on "Stability of Tâtonnement Processes of Short Period Equilibria with Rational Expectations"
97111	C. Fernández, E. Ley, and M.F.J. Steel	Statistical Modeling of Fishing Activities in the North Atlantic
97112	J.J.A. Moors	A Critical Evaluation of Mangat's Two-Step Procedure in Randomized Response
97113	J.J.A. Moors, B.B. van der Genugten, and L.W.G. Strijbosch	Repeated Audit Controls
97114	X. Gong and A. van Soest	Family Structure and Female Labour Supply in Mexico City
97115	A. Blume, D.V. DeJong, Y.-G. Kim and G.B. Sprinkle	Evolution of Communication with Partial Common Interest
97116	J.P.C. Kleijnen and R.G. Sargent	A Methodology for Fitting and Validating Metamodels in Simulation
97117	J. Boone	Technological Progress and Unemployment

No.	Author(s)	Title
97118	A. Prat	Campaign Advertising and Voter Welfare
9801	H. Gersbach and H. Uhlig	Debt Contracts, Collapse and Regulation as Competition Phenomena
9802	P. Peretto and S. Smulders	Specialization, Knowledge Dilution, and Scale Effects in an IO-based Growth Model
9803	K.J.M. Huisman and P.M. Kort	A Further Analysis on Strategic Timing of Adoption of New Technologies under Uncertainty
9804	P.J.-J. Herings and A. van den Elzen	Computation of the Nash Equilibrium Selected by the Tracing Procedure in N -Person Games
9805	P.J.-J. Herings and J.H. Drèze	Continua of Underemployment Equilibria
9806	M. Koster	Multi-Service Serial Cost Sharing: A Characterization of the Moulin-Shenker Rule
9807	F.A. de Roon, Th.E. Nijman and B.J.M. Werker	Testing for Mean-Variance Spanning with Short Sales Constraints and Transaction Costs: The Case of Emerging Markets
9808	R.M.W.J. Beetsma and P.C. Schotman	Measuring Risk Attitudes in a Natural Experiment: Data from the Television Game Show Lingo
9809	M. Bütler	The Choice between Pension Reform Options
9810	L. Bettendorf and F. Verboven	Competition on the Dutch Coffee Market
9811	E. Schaling, M. Hoeberichts and S. Eijffinger	Incentive Contracts for Central Bankers under Uncertainty: Walsh-Svensson non-Equivalence Revisited
9812	M. Slikker	Average Convexity in Communication Situations
9813	T. van de Klundert and S. Smulders	Capital Mobility and Catching Up in a Two-Country, Two-Sector Model of Endogenous Growth
9814	A. Belke and D. Gros	Evidence on the Costs of Intra-European Exchange Rate Variability
9815	J.P.C. Kleijnen and O. Pala	Maximizing the Simulation Output: a Competition
9816	C. Dustmann, N. Rajah and A. van Soest	School Quality, Exam Performance, and Career Choice
9817	H. Hamers, F. Klijn and J. Suijs	On the Balancedness of m -Sequencing Games
9818	S.J. Koopman and J. Durbin	Fast Filtering and Smoothing for Multivariate State Space Models
9819	E. Droste, M. Kosfeld and	Regret Equilibria in Games

No.	Author(s)	Title
	M. Voorneveld	
9820	M. Slikker	A Note on Link Formation
9821	M. Koster, E. Molina, Y. Sprumont and S. Tijs	Core Representations of the Standard Fixed Tree Game
9822	J.P.C. Kleijnen	Validation of Simulation, With and Without Real Data
9823	M. Kosfeld	Rumours and Markets
9824	F. Karaesmen, F. van der Duyn Schouten and L.N. van Wassen- hove	Dedication versus Flexibility in Field Service Operations
9825	J. Suijs, A. De Waegenaere and P. Borm	Optimal Design of Pension Funds: A Mission Impossible
9826	U.Gneezy and W. Güth	On Competing Rewards Standards -An Experimental Study of Ultimatum Bargaining-
9827	M. Dufwenberg and U. Gneezy	Price Competition and Market Concentration: An Experimental Study
9828	A. Blume, D.V. De Jong and G.R. Neumann	Learning in Sender-Receiver Games
9829	B.G.C. Dellaert, J.D. Brazell and J.J. Louviere	Variations in Consumer Choice Consistency: The Case of Attribute-Level Driven Shifts in Consistency
9830	B.G.C. Dellaert, A.W.J. Borgers, J.J. Louviere and H.J.P. Timmermans	Consumer Choice of Modularized Products: A Conjoint choice Experiment Approach
9831	E.G.A. Gaury, H. Pierreval and J.P.C. Kleijnen	New Species of Hybrid Pull Systems
9832	S.J. Koopman and H.N. Lai	Modelling Bid-Ask Spreads in Competitive Dealership Markets
9833	F. Klijn, M. Slikker, S. Tijs and J. Zarzuelo	Characterizations of the Egalitarian Solution for Convex Games
9834	C. Fershtman, N. Gandal and S. Markovich	Estimating the Effect of Tax Reform in Differentiated Product Oligopolistic Markets
9835	M. Zeelenberg, W.W. van Dijk, J. van der Pligt, A.S.R. Manstead, P. van Empelen and D. Reinderman	Emotional Reactions to the Outcomes of Decisions: The Role of Counterfactual Thought in the Experience of Regret and Disappointment
9836	M. Zeelenberg, W.W. van Dijk and A.S.R. Manstead	Reconsidering the Relation between Regret and Responsibility

No.	Author(s)	Title
9837	M. Dufwenberg and G. Kirchsteiger	A Theory of Sequential Reciprocity
9838	A. Xepapadeas and A. de Zeeuw	Environmental Policy and Competitiveness: The Porter Hypothesis and the Composition of Capital
9839	M. Lubyova and J.C. van Ours	Unemployment Durations of Job Losers in a Labor Market in Transition
9840	P. Bolton and X. Freixas	A Dilution Cost Approach to Financial Intermediation and Securities Markets
9841	A. Rustichini	Minimizing Regret: The General Case
9842	J. Boone	Competitive Pressure, Selection and Investments in Development and Fundamental Research
9843	H.L.F. de Groot	Macroeconomic Consequences of Outsourcing. An Analysis of Growth, Welfare, and Product Variety
9844	U. Gneezy, W. Güth and F. Verboven	Presents or Investments? An Experimental Analysis
9845	A. Prat	How Homogeneous Should a Team Be?
9846	P. Borm and H. Hamers	A Note on Games Corresponding to Sequencing Situations with Due Dates
9847	A.J. Hoogstrate and T. Osang	Saving, Openness, and Growth
9848	H. Degryse and A. Irmen	On the Incentives to Provide Fuel-Efficient Automobiles
9849	J. Bouckaert and H. Degryse	Price Competition Between an Expert and a Non-Expert
9850	J.R. ter Horst, Th. E. Nijman and F.A. de Roon	Style Analysis and Performance Evaluation of Dutch Mutual Funds
9851	J.R. ter Horst, Th. E. Nijman and F.A. de Roon	Performance Analysis of International Mutual Funds Incorporating Market Frictions
9852	F. Klaassen	Improving GARCH Volatility Forecasts
9853	F.J.G.M. Klaassen and J.R. Magnus	On the Independence and Identical Distribution of Points in Tennis
9854	J. de Haan, F. Amtenbrink and S.C.W. Eijffinger	Accountability of Central Banks: Aspects and Quantification
9855	J.R. ter Horst, Th.E. Nijman and M. Verbeek	Eliminating Biases in Evaluating Mutual Fund Performance from a Survivorship Free Sample
9856	G.J. van den Berg, B. van der Klaauw and J.C. van Ours	Punitive Sanctions and the Transition Rate from Welfare to Work

No.	Author(s)	Title
9857	U. Gneezy and A. Rustichini	Pay Enough-Or Don't Pay at All
9858	C. Fershtman	A Note on Multi-Issue Two-Sided Bargaining: Bilateral Procedures
9859	M. Kaneko	Evolution of Thoughts: Deductive Game Theories in the Inductive Game Situation. Part I
9860	M. Kaneko	Evolution of Thoughts: Deductive Game Theories in the Inductive Game Situation. Part II
9861	H. Huizinga and S.B. Nielsen	Is Coordination of Fiscal Deficits Necessary?
9862	M. Voorneveld and A. van den Nouweland	Cooperative Multicriteria Games with Public and Private Criteria; An Investigation of Core Concepts
9863	E.W. van Luijk and J.C. van Ours	On the Determinants of Opium Consumption; An Empirical Analysis of Historical Data
9864	B.G.C. Dellaert and B.E. Kahn	How Tolerable is Delay? Consumers' Evaluations of Internet Web Sites after Waiting
9865	E.W. van Luijk and J.C. van Ours	How Government Policy Affects the Consumption of Hard Drugs: The Case of Opium in Java, 1873-1907
9866	G. van der Laan and R. van den Brink	A Banzhaf Share Function for Cooperative Games in Coalition Structure
9867	G. Kirchsteiger, M. Niederle and J. Potters	The Endogenous Evolution of Market Institutions An Experimental Investigation
9868	E. van Damme and S. Hurkens	Endogenous Price Leadership



17 000 01598301 9